





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS





*The Hon<sup>ble</sup> John Talbot &c. &c  
with the author's best regards & compliments*

THE POSITION  
OF  
THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

WITH REGARD TO  
LITURGICAL USAGE, AND COMMUNION WITH THE UNITED  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND :

A  
C H A R G E

ADDRESSED TO THE  
CLERGY OF THE CITY AND DISTRICT OF GLASGOW,

MAY 7, 1845.

BY THE  
RIGHT REV. M. RUSSELL, LL.D., D.C.L., OXON.

---

EDINBURGH :

OLIVER & BOYD, TWEEDDALE COURT ; ROB<sup>t</sup>. GRANT & SON,  
PRINCES STREET ; DAVID ROBERTSON, GLASGOW ;  
AND FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON, LONDON.

MDCCCXLV.

---

[*Price One Shilling.*]



THE POSITION  
OF THE  
SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH, &c.

---

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

WHEN our Blessed Lord sent forth his disciples to sow the seed of eternal life in the land of Israel, he prepared them for opposition, suffering, and disappointment, in the following remarkable words: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes shall be they of his own household."

In so saying, our Redeemer meant not to assert that the natural fruits of the heavenly tree which he was then planting with his own hand, and was about to water with his blood, were to be nothing better than variance, contention, hatred, and mutual violence. He simply foresaw that such would be the effect of his doctrines and injunctions on the selfish passions of mankind. In the character of the Jews, more especially as connected with their fallen estate and their expectations of the Messiah,

he could detect the immediate source of all the evils which he foretold—unbelief, strife, rage, the flight of peace, and the entrance of the bloody sword. The self-dénial enjoined by the gospel, and the extinction of all those fond hopes of earthly power of which its progress denoted the failure, made the Hebrew, at length, accuse his own blindness, and lift up his hand against every one who read the Old Testament in a light different from that which, in his eyes, justified the expectation of a great triumph for the house of David throughout the eastern world. In this respect, the religion of the New Covenant acted like the rays of the gracious sun, which bring health and fertility to every land where no deadly infection lurks in the soil or pollutes the air; but which, wherever the elements of corruption are ready to be set in motion by the intensity of his beams, are found to generate disease and death. On a principle somewhat similar, the Saviour of the world, though his last bequest was peace, and his last precept brotherly love, saw in the perspective of the future, wrath, envy, and all uncharitableness, even among those who should confess his name.

The experience of eighteen hundred years has proved but too painfully the truth of our Lord's prediction; for, during that long period, the church has been in a militant state, not only as being assailed by her open enemies, but as suffering from wounds inflicted by false, weak, or injudicious friends. Even in the society of the Apostles themselves, difference of opinion was allowed to proceed



so far as occasionally to interrupt the harmony and disturb the proceedings of the most distinguished of their number. St Paul, for example, does not conceal that at Antioch he withstood St Peter to the face, because he thought him worthy of blame ; and the inspired author of the book of Acts, in reference to the same great Missionary of the Gentiles, relates, that “ his contention with Barnabas was so sharp that they departed asunder, the one from the other,” to meet no more upon earth.

Such things are written for our learning, who have the records of so many centuries to guide us ; not a few of which are stained with blood, and darkened by the fierce passions of ambition, intolerance, and revenge. There is not a member of any christian body, who, with the annals of his communion spread out before him, will not find occasion to lament that the intemperance of a blind zeal has too frequently obtruded itself, where the interests of faith and piety should alone have warmed the heart and strengthened the arm. It is exceedingly painful to reflect, that as soon as the followers of Christ had ceased to suffer from the hands of pagan rulers, they themselves assumed the weapons of a warfare not less to be deplored. Nor has this great evil quite disappeared in our own day ; for though the gentler manners and the improved legislation of modern times preclude any direct attack on the person or the life, the son may still be seen at variance with his father, the daughter with her mother, and the daughter-in-law with her mother-in-law ; and hence, in too many instances,

the Scripture continues to be fulfilled which saith  
 “ a man’s foes are they of his own house.”

But is this evil a necessary one? Is it inseparable from that religion, which, above all things, enjoins peace, long-suffering, and charity? Are we to conclude that the denunciation once pronounced against the family of the Psalmist is to be realized without ceasing in the tents of the Redeemer—“the sword shall never depart from thine house?” Must Christianity appear for ever a large battle-field, echoing the voice of fear, threatening, and lamentation; still grieving the world with a succession of melancholy proofs of how trifling are the grounds on which those who call themselves brethren have most frequently disagreed?

The fault is assuredly in ourselves; and the blame with which we are chargeable will appear in a more aggravated light, when we reflect that the evils we apprehend, and the errors we make haste to condemn, are frequently the offspring of our own ignorance or want of temper. We are, said an old writer, “like querulous brethren, who having agreed on the main division of their inheritance, fell out about some heaps of rubbish.” In such matters we are equally impatient and unjust; we show least indulgence where forbearance is most needed, I mean, to the infirmity and indocility of ignorance. The unity of the church and the repose of her members have frequently been sacrificed to pride, disappointment, and self-conceit, on the part of individuals who preferred their own groundless scruples to the welfare of the christian body. Let

us not, then, shut our eyes so closely to the sorrows and sufferings of past days, as to render the word of God, and the history of his church, a blank unprofitable page.

These remarks are intended to bespeak a patient hearing for some observations which I am about to make on the position of the Scottish Episcopal Church, viewed in connexion with the liturgical forms and usages of the great Establishment of England and Ireland.

You are all aware, that one of the conditions upon which the Act of 1792 was passed, which relieved our communion from the pressure of the penal laws, was, that we should adopt the same standard of belief with the English church; in other words, that our clergy should sign the Thirty-nine Articles. As to the form of public worship, no stipulation was made farther than that the sovereign and royal family should be regularly prayed for, during Divine Service, in the words of the English Liturgy. That ritual was already in general use among the Scottish Episcopalians, with some slight verbal alterations which did not in any degree affect its meaning. It was therefore most willingly adopted by them as their Common Prayer, with the exception, in some instances, of the Communion-Office, which both by the clergy and laity of particular districts was thought inferior to one already in their hands, and compiled from more ancient models.—(Note I., end.)

The step now mentioned was not taken without due consideration; and we are, accordingly, prepared to defend not only the Liturgy which was thus bor-

rowed at a recent period, but also that less popular Office, which, in substance, has descended from the time of Edward the Sixth. In this country, by the unlearned and the uncandid, both the one and the other are charged with a popish tendency; and, perhaps, neither is perfectly understood even by those who are accustomed to use them. The imputation of popery is the most efficacious weapon which can be used in Scotland, whenever a difference of opinion arises among contending divines; and upon looking into the pages of our national history, you will find that, from the reign of James VI. down to the present day, it has uniformly been employed as often as the leaders of a party have wished to engage the popular feeling in favour of their measures.

Since the period of the Reformation, when men's minds were divided as to the extent to which the principle of change should be permitted to act, two great parties have always existed, though with varying strength and pretensions; the one being ever disposed to lament that too much of the ancient ritual was retained, and mingling with their regrets a distinct insinuation that their opponents are not disinclined to symbolize still more intimately with Rome. Ever and anon occasions occur to give a wider range and a firmer tone to their remonstrances; and at present, all over the island, there is a manifest tendency to question usages which have been long respected, and to impugn the soundness of doctrines which were approved by the fathers of the reformed church. Even the clerical vestments, or at least the place and purpose of wearing them,

have again been brought under dispute in several parts of England. The Liturgy itself is frequently made the subject of discussion; its most solemn services are canvassed in no friendly spirit; and in certain quarters, intimation is given in very unambiguous language, that a convenient season must soon be found for revising several of its Offices, and rendering them less offensive to tender minds. In a word, impatience of control and disregard of authority are becoming every day more manifest; impelled by a spirit in whose eyes nothing is valuable but what is comparatively new, and which is ever ready to set at defiance all the conclusions of ancient wisdom.

No such feeling of suspicion or disparagement is displayed among the indigenous Episcopalians of Scotland, who, when they adopted the Anglican Liturgy, explained its language on the principles of those who compiled it. In this matter, they proceeded on the fair and generous rule that, in order to establish truth as well as harmony in the religious world, men ought always to consider the light in which doctrines are placed by those who sincerely hold them, and not as they may happen to be represented by others, whose object it is to excite doubt in regard to the principles on which they rest, or to invalidate the arguments by which they are maintained. It is too obvious to require notice on our part, that objections have been raised to certain expressions in the Liturgy, which to those who have studied the purpose of the compilers, and made allowance for the inevitable change produced by

time in the meaning of words, present no difficulty whatever.

1. To illustrate the remark now made, it will be sufficient to allude to the Office for the ministration of Baptism ; the doctrine involved in which, though frequently misrepresented, can hardly fail to be understood by every one who has paid the smallest attention to its history, and to the original import of the words in which it is expressed. The use of the term Regeneration, as connected with that sacrament, is undoubtedly scriptural, and it was used, too, with this special reference in the purest ages of the church. The evil complained of has arisen entirely from want of attention to a secondary meaning which, in times comparatively modern, has attached itself to the word under consideration : whence it is manifest that those who assign to it an import which it did not originally bear, owe all their difficulties to themselves. No intelligent member of the Episcopal Communion has ever maintained that all baptized persons are, by virtue of the sacrament, placed in a path which must necessarily lead them to eternal life. The article of faith held by the church respecting it, and implied as well as announced in the Offices for Baptism and Confirmation, is, that the penalty attached to the first transgression is thereby removed, and that the sin itself is forgiven. But it is nowhere insinuated that the end of our christian calling is accomplished by the mere ministration of the initiatory ordinance. It is not taught in the holy ritual that every branch engrafted into the mystical body of the Redeemer shall bear fruit unto

everlasting salvation. On the contrary, in one of her most solemn festivals, the church teaches us to pray, that “we, being regenerate and made the children of God by adoption and grace, may daily be renewed by his Holy Spirit.” The same doctrine is clearly conveyed in the prayer pronounced by the bishop, when about to minister the Apostolical rite of Confirmation: “Almighty and everlasting God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins; strengthen them, we beseech thee, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them thy manifold gifts of grace,” &c.

These things are understood by every novice in theology; and yet the Anglican church is sometimes accused, even by such of her own sons as have failed to appreciate her principles, of holding and teaching a popish doctrine in the two Offices now mentioned. But the Scottish Episcopalian does not so misinterpret the meaning of the ritual according to which he ministers: he received it in good faith, and he follows out its injunctions without wavering; never perverting the language from its obvious intention, nor ascribing to the greatest church of the Reformation an unprotestant spirit concealed under a thin veil of words.

2. A similar imputation has been directed against the form of Absolution in the Order for the Visitation of Sick. It also is viewed as a stumbling-block by many, who, while they continue in the communion of the church, take refuge from the apparent

anomaly by abstaining from its use in every case. Nothing assuredly can be more clear than the rubric; and nothing could be more distinctly expressed than the formula in which the remission of sins is conveyed to the penitent. After a special confession made to him, the priest is instructed to say: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

The precise import of these solemn words it may not be easy to define. It may be that the absolution, strictly so called, has a reference to somewhat which the church herself has against the sick man; neglect of her ordinances, or a violation of engagements made to her. The form consists of two parts—the one a prayer for mercy, and the other a declaration of forgiveness; the first apparently relating to the attributes of God, the second to the claims of the church, viewed as a judicial body deriving her power from Christ. At all events, it is perfectly manifest, that the remission of sin pronounced by the priest does not extend to the eternal punishment denounced against transgression; for no sooner has he uttered the authoritative words, than he proceeds to pray in the following terms: "O most merciful God, who according to the multitude of thy mercies, dost so put away the sins of those who truly repent, that thou rememberest them no more, open thine eye of mercy upon thy servant, *who most earnestly desireth par-*



*don and forgiveness*; preserve and continue him in the unity of the church; and forasmuch as he putteth his full trust only in thy mercy, impute not unto him his former sins," &c.

If the sins of the sick man were understood to have been already remitted by the authority of the priest, what occasion could there be to pray for pardon and forgiveness, which the penitent, immediately after receiving absolution, is said "most earnestly to desire?"—(Note II., end.)

3. The Ordination Service has been likewise objected to as offensive to weak consciences. When a bishop ordains a minister of the second order, he is directed to utter the following words: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands: whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained."

These expressions, not properly understood, have been made a rock of offence, inasmuch as they appear, when used by an uninspired man, to convey a gift which he himself does not possess, and to savour of presumptuousness in a matter where there ought to be the utmost simplicity and self-denial. The profane have scoffed, and the ignorant have been perplexed, upon hearing a man of like infirmity with themselves say to another, in the most solemn circumstances in which two human beings can meet together, "receive the Holy Ghost."

But the main difficulty disappears when we are reminded that those words, even when originally

pronounced by our Blessed Saviour, did not imply any thing miraculous or unusual. We must distinguish between the ministerial commission, conferred by our Lord when he was about to leave this world, and the supernatural endowments bestowed upon the Apostles on the day of Pentecost. In the one case he gave to his disciples the mere official authority; in the other he granted the power which at that time was necessary for the effectual exercise of it, towards the great purpose of evangelizing the world. The first was a simple ordination, the appointment to act as his missionaries, but nothing more; and therefore he commanded them not to enter upon the discharge of the solemn duties to which they had been called, until they should have received a mighty aid from on high.

But the meaning of the words used by our Blessed Saviour, when he ordained the Apostles, will be more fully comprehended, if we view them in their relation to the opinions and practices of the ancient Jews. Every one appointed to take any part in the service of God was understood to have received one or more gifts of the Holy Spirit; and, on this principle, to be invested with the priesthood, and to have had the Spirit of God shed down upon him, were, under the ancient economy, expressions nearly synonymous. In some cases, it is true, such commission implied the foreknowledge of future events, and constituted a prophet in the more common acceptation of the term; but, generally speaking, the spiritual endowment was confined to the ordinary ministrations of religion, and implied nothing more than that the

individual on whom it was conferred was devoted to the service of God's house, whether the tabernacle or the temple.

Nay, you will find that men employed in much inferior offices were said to be endued with the spirit of God to qualify them for their several duties. When the tabernacle was about to be framed in the wilderness, the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, "I have called by name Bezaleel the son of Uri, of the tribe of Judah, and I have filled him with the *spirit of God*, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to work in gold, and silver, and in brass." Even this employment was considered so far sacred, that Bezaleel was called to it by a special nomination from heaven, and prepared for its several offices by a supernatural endowment.

In the book of Numbers you will find an example still more intelligible and instructive, where the bestowal of the "Spirit of God" can only mean a formal and regular appointment to an office. When the labour of governing the twelve Tribes became too heavy for Moses, he prayed to God that he might be in part relieved from its pressure. "And the Lord said unto him, gather me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be elders of the people, and officers over them, and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with thee there: and *I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them*; and they shall bear

the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone.”

In this case it admits not of any doubt, that to take part of the spirit which was upon Moses, and to put it upon the seventy elders, was merely to transfer from him to them a portion of the authority which he had found it inconvenient to exercise. You will find, again, that when this distinguished servant of God had arrived at the close of his labours, he conveyed, in a manner somewhat similar, the whole of his authority to Joshua, who was appointed to succeed him : “ And Joshua the son of Nun was *full of the spirit of wisdom, because Moses had laid his hands upon him.*”

It is in agreement with the same notion and usage that we shall most clearly understand the bequeathment of official power which was given to his successor by Elijah when about to ascend into heaven. “ And it came to pass, that Elijah said unto Elisha, Ask what I shall do for thee, before I am taken from thee. And Elisha said, I pray thee let a double portion of thy spirit rest upon me. And he said, Thou hast asked a hard thing ; nevertheless, if thou see me when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee.” The aspiring prophet received the mantle as it fell, and he cherished it as a token of authority and pre-eminence. Nor did his claim as the chief minister of the Hebrews fail to be recognised by those who were the most competent to decide on his pretensions ; for when the sons of the prophets saw him, they said, “ The spirit of Elijah doth rest upon him. And they came

to meet him, and bowed themselves to the ground before him.”

In this case, as in that of Moses, the spirit which was removed from one person to another, could be nothing else than the authority, or spiritual office, with which the former had been invested, and which we find could be conveyed in whole or in part. The word spirit cannot, indeed, be properly understood in any other sense; for, in a literal acceptation, the spirit of one man, or a portion of his spirit, cannot be conveyed to another, whether for procuring the benefit of his aid, or maintaining a succession.

From these references to the ancient Scriptures, you will be satisfied that, to receive the spirit of God, and to receive the nomination to a holy function, meant precisely the same thing. That spirit was indeed given in different measures, according to the purposes which Divine Providence meant thereby to accomplish; but in all cases, whether the authority was great or small, every man who was raised to a sacred office was accounted spiritual, and held to be endued with certain gifts of the Holy Ghost. In the book of Hosea, where the corruption of the priesthood is deeply lamented, the inspired writer declares, that the “prophet is a fool, and that the man of the spirit is mad.” The latter expression, “the man of the spirit,” evidently denotes an authorized teacher of the word, and a steward of the divine mysteries. St John, adopting a similar phraseology, cautioned the early christians against believing every spirit, but exhorted them to try the

spirits whether they were of God, because many false prophets had gone out into the world. The spirits to whom the good Apostle alludes were men who professed to have an authoritative commission as ministers of Christ; as having had the divine spirit put upon them; and as possessing on that account a claim to be heard. Try those spiritual men, said the beloved disciple, whether they be of God; for all who announce themselves as the ministers of the Redeemer, do not speak the truth as it is in Jesus.

The same great principle may be farther illustrated by adverting to the circumstances which attended the ordination—if we may presume so to call it—of our Blessed Lord himself, who received the priesthood from God the Father. No man, saith the Scripture, taketh this honour to himself, but must receive it as Aaron did, who was called to it by divine authority. Even the Saviour of the world glorified not himself so far as to assume the high-priesthood, but received it from Him who said, “thou art my beloved Son, this day have I begotten thee.” The allusion of the inspired writer, it is clear, is to the third chapters of St Matthew and St Luke, where it is related that immediately after his baptism, the heavens were opened, and the Spirit of God descended upon him: and, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.” The latter of the two evangelists mentions, that Jesus, “being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan;” and after a brief space of

trial, we find that he entered upon his ministry, preaching repentance and announcing that the kingdom of heaven was at hand.

The remark of the evangelist, that our Lord returned from Jordan, the scene of his consecration, "full of the Holy Ghost," could not imply any increase of sanctity in his divine nature, but denoted merely the fulness or amplitude of his commission, as the minister of the New Covenant. On the solemn occasion now mentioned, the spirit was given to him in the same sense in which it was given to prophets and priests under the Old Economy, but in a much higher degree. To all others it was given in a limited measure, because their commission had a limited object; but to his authority no bounds were set, because his ministry extended to the salvation of the whole human race.

It is enough for our purpose to have established the principle, that the receiving the Holy Spirit, even as applied to our Saviour, meant only the conferring upon him a certain office, as the Mediator between God and man: and more especially when we find, that after pronouncing the words, "receive ye the Holy Ghost," he assured his disciples that as his Father had sent him, even so did he send them.

In the same sense the expression is not improperly applied by a bishop at the present day when he assigns to one fitly qualified the office and work of a priest in the church of God. As the form of words, when used by Jesus Christ, did not imply the conveyance of miraculous powers, it has been very properly continued in all subsequent ages. The objec-

tions, therefore, which are sometimes urged against the Ordinal, being founded in ignorance or misapprehension, are not entertained, so far as I have ever heard, by any professional members of the Scottish Episcopal Church. On the contrary, the Liturgy at large, though not incapable of being made better by a judicious curtailment and the removal of doubtful expressions, is considered by us as the most perfect form of Prayer and Sacred Offices used by any portion of the reformed church. It requires, no doubt, a candid reader; for he who is determined to find popery in it, will want neither matter nor occasion in the ambiguities of human speech.

But the charge of a Romish bias applies not more to that portion of the public Service which we have borrowed from the United Church, than to that smaller portion which has been derived from a more ancient source. This allusion, you are aware, points to the Scottish Communion-Office, which of late has been so far misrepresented as to have become a cause of stumbling in the path of the less informed members of our body.

The difference of opinion which prevails respecting the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper may be traced back to a period more ancient than the Reformation, when the dissentients from the Roman church, on both sides of the Alps, taking offence at the new doctrine of transubstantiation, allowed themselves to be carried so far into the opposite extreme as to hold the opinion, that the most solemn ordinance in the christian ritual is nothing more than a common eating and drinking, in re-



membrance of a great event in the history of the gospel. Without the intervention of priest or other sacred person, whose presence was deemed unnecessary, the hardy natives of the Valleys cut a slice of loaf, and poured out a cup of wine or water, which they ate and drank, as a token that they had not forgotten the sufferings of Jesus Christ for the welfare of the human race. Never did the Church of Rome commit a greater mistake than was made by her when she attempted to define the mode, and manner of operation, according to which the bread and wine presented on the holy table become the body and blood of our Saviour. On this most mysterious subject the language of the christian community had been uniform, and was received by all without difficulty, because it was scriptural. Every believer retained in his memory the words of the Redeemer, who said of the bread, "this is my body," and of the wine, "this is my blood." The language of St Paul, too, sustained the same belief: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" In asserting this sublime doctrine, the early ages shrunk not from the strongest terms which the languages of the East or West could supply. Hieronymus, for example, writing concerning the dignity of the priesthood, described those who served at the altar as the ministers *ad quorum preces Christi corpus sanguisque conficitur*—as those by means of whose prayers the body and blood of Christ are realized or effected.

Such language was used century after century, and was regarded as a suitable expression of the christian faith, relative to that incomprehensible dogma which connects the sacrifice of the Son of God with the salvation of man.

But from the days of Innocent the Third, when the corporal presence in the sacrament was declared to be the doctrine of the western church, the harmony which had formerly prevailed ceased to be enjoyed by the faithful. The use of a term which is not to be found in Scripture perplexed their imaginations: they were invited to reason on a subject which was acknowledged to pass human comprehension; and they were grieved when they saw the learned among their divines attempting to find a basis for the most important tenet of their theological system in the subtle distinctions of Grecian metaphysics. The communion of Rome was no longer one body, nor animated by one spirit. Two parties now claimed the right to dogmatize on the Sacrament of the Supper, and they have ever since occupied the extreme points in regard to their conceptions of that sacred ordinance: the one holding the high notions of transubstantiation, while the other regard it as a simple commemoration of a distinguished act of benevolence and self-denial on the part of our blessed Lord.

Nor were the reformers themselves of one mind as to the nature and purposes of the Holy Communion. The Helvetian school embraced the lower views; while the adherents of Luther originated opinions on the subject not less inconsistent with ancient

Christianity than those which were afterwards promulgated by the Council of Trent. The Church of England pursued a wiser course; retaining the language of pure antiquity, without any attempt to analyze the incomprehensible truth it implies, or to define minutely the terms used in reference to it by the Divine Founder and his inspired servants. The bread, after consecration, is by her called the body, and the wine, after being blessed, is called the blood of Christ.

Some of the continental reformers who visited England in the reign of Edward the Sixth, objected to certain expressions in the first Liturgy published under the auspices of that prince; and as Cranmer, who felt the weakness of the protestant cause at home, was desirous that a union should be established among all who had seceded from the Church of Rome, he yielded so far to their wishes as to induce the king to issue orders that the forms of Prayer should be subjected to a review. But that there was no intention to alter the doctrine contained in the Communion-Office is manifest from the fact, that his majesty publicly declared, that “the Lord’s Supper, as it was thereby administered, was brought even to the very use as Christ left it; as the Apostles used it; and as the holy fathers delivered it.” In the Act of Parliament, too, by which the first book was called in, it was affirmed to be “agreeable to God’s word and the primitive church.”

The apprehensions entertained by Bucer, Peter Martyr, and others, who dreaded the vestments not much less intensely than the doctrines of Rome,

were not perhaps unreasonable, though frequently excessive. In the reign of Mary, when the interests of the older communion were again promoted, the Romanists condemned the reformed Liturgy and Catechism as being quite inconsistent with the doctrine of the Mass; thereby proving that the fears of the more rigid reformers were, in their opinion at least, altogether groundless. Nor did the alterations in the second book of Edward affect the *doctrine* of the sacrament so much as the manner of setting it forth. But as this is not a fitting place or time for historical details, I shall at once proceed to show, that the doctrine of the Scottish Communion-Office does not differ in any degree from the principles contained in the Anglican forms, as sanctioned by Parliament, first in the reign of Edward, and afterwards in that of Elizabeth.—(Note III., end.)

The doctrine in all the Offices now mentioned may be simply stated as embracing the leading tenet of the church universal, namely, that the bread and wine, after being blessed or consecrated, are the body and blood of Christ, in the sense which he himself meant to convey, when he instituted this solemn memorial of his death and passion for the remission of sins. Our very children are taught this saving truth in the strongest and least ambiguous language that the English tongue can supply. The Catechism, while it states that the outward part of the Lord's Supper are bread and wine, asserts, "that the inward part or thing signified are the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the

Lord's Supper." When a clergyman gives warning of the celebration of this sacred rite, he invites the religiously and devoutly disposed to "the most comfortable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ." In his exhortation he addresses himself to those who "mind to come to the holy communion of the body and blood of Christ"—where "we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood; where we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us."—In the prayer of access we say, "Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood." We pray farther, that we, receiving the creatures of bread and wine, according to Christ's holy institution, "may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood." And, finally, in the post Communion Service, we heartily thank the Almighty, who doth vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received the holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the "most precious body and blood of his Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ."

From the language of the Anglican church, as now quoted, there cannot be any doubt that she regards the consecrated elements as the body and blood of Christ, in the mystical sense in which he himself, his apostles, and the primitive church, originally used the expression. The Scottish Communion-Office holds precisely the same view in regard to these sacred emblems. In respect indeed to doctrine, properly so called, there is not the slightest shade of difference: the only point in which there

is any variance is in the prayer of consecration, by means of which the bread and wine are blessed, and pass into or become the "consecrated elements," figuratively called the body and blood of Christ. In the Anglican form this process is understood to be accomplished by simply pronouncing the words of institution, "In the same night he was betrayed, he took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to them, saying, Take eat, this is my body, &c. Likewise after supper he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood," &c.

The recital or narrative now given is also held by the Church of Rome to be the means or instrument of consecration; and every sincere member of that communion believes the miracle of transubstantiation to be effected, when the priest pronounces the words of our Lord, translated into Latin, "*Hoc enim est corpus meum,*" &c. At that moment, the wafer which he holds in his hand is understood to be changed into the actual body which was conceived of the Virgin Mary, born at Bethlehem, and stretched on the cross at Jerusalem. Hence the Roman Catholic maintains that, after consecration, the elements of bread and wine no longer remain, but that a perfect body of our Saviour is given to every individual who receives the host at the hand of the priest; so that a miracle is constantly repeated, to the reality of which the senses bear no evidence.—(Note IV.)

Though holding a very different doctrine, the English church relies upon the same form of words

for consecrating the elements, namely, those spoken by our Lord when he instituted the sacrament of the last supper. To avoid the scandal of the corporal presence, Cranmer consented to relinquish the Invocation; a prayer in which God's Holy Spirit is invoked to bless the bread and the wine; the principal petition of which is thus expressed in the first Liturgy of Edward: "Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee; and with thy Holy Spirit and Word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son." This is esteemed the proper prayer of consecration; and it was in substance, and indeed nearly in the same terms, used by all the churches of the West, long before the errors of popery, relative to the Lord's Supper, were introduced. Before I conclude, I shall have occasion to show that it has been approved by some of the most learned Divines of the Church of England, who regret its omission in their form, and lament that so important a sacrifice was made to conciliate the benevolence of those who had no power to do good.

Twice has the Establishment of the South attempted to effect a uniformity, doctrinal and ecclesiastical, with foreign protestants, on a ground common to both; and on each occasion did she lose strength and character. The first instance was in the days of Cranmer, as already mentioned; and the second, proposed by Turretin, took place under Tillotson and Wake. In the eighteenth century as well as in the sixteenth, it was found that the continental

protestants were not themselves sufficiently agreed in their tenets to admit of a compact with others.

The alterations in the Communion-Office were part of the price paid for the expected co-operation, on the part of the calvinistic professors at home and abroad. John Knox accordingly, with Martyr and Bucer, assisted in accomplishing the change; and hence may be explained the Zuinglian tendency which is perceptible in many parts, and the studied departure from ancient usage not less than ancient feeling, in regard to the elements. The bread and wine, remaining after the Communion, were directed to be given to the curate; no distinction being made between what was consecrated and what was not. Even where the right doctrine was held, it was placed, as it were, under a veil, suppressed and clouded; and lest there should be any suspicion that the faithful departed were in any degree called to remembrance, when showing forth the death of him who brought life and immortality to light, the concluding sentences of the prayer for the whole state of Christ's church were entirely left out. In truth, the Reformation in many parts of Europe showed contempt of the sacraments, and a desire to reject them. So far was this bad spirit manifested, even in England, that it became necessary in the reign of Edward the Sixth to pass an Act against speaking irreverently of the holy Communion. The strong hand of Elizabeth imposed a firmer check on this downward tendency: she restored some essential parts of the Liturgy, and thereby saved her countrymen from the latitudinarianism which soon afterwards paralyzed the continental



reformers, and from the unitarian heresy, which has followed, in too many instances, the inordinate calvinism of the puritans at home.

But with respect to the Communion-Office, the queen found it expedient to make a covenant with circumstances, and to leave out the prayer of Invocation, lest the more tender minds should apprehend a return towards the corporal presence, or doctrine of the Mass. The bread and wine are no doubt, throughout the Service, described as the body and blood of the Redeemer; nevertheless it was deemed proper to leave out the petition which, in the ears of the peevish or uninstructed, might sound like the "magic virtue of the priestly office," in effecting the relative change on the simple elements. In this case was shown that weakness or infelicity of human wisdom which, in the attempt to avoid one evil, not unfrequently rushes into another and a worse, on the opposite side. The invocation was omitted, though warranted by the purest antiquity; while the reliance for consecrating the sacrament was placed on the words of institution,—a modern device, and introduced by the Church of Rome, when she had ceased to be guided, in this important matter, by the light of primitive example. All the ancient liturgies, except the Roman missal, has the prayer by which the Holy Spirit is invoked or called down to bless the bread and wine, after the words of institution have been pronounced; proceeding on the principle, that the blessing or sanctification of any object devoted to the service of the Almighty, cannot be accomplished except by the

word of God and prayer. This is the doctrine of St Paul, and it corresponds to the practice of our Lord. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?"

It was on the point now indicated that a preference was given by a portion of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, to a Communion-Office which had been many years in use, and founded on the principles of the first Liturgy of Edward VI. Compared with that of Elizabeth, there is a slight difference in the arrangement of the other prayers; but the characteristic distinction is found in that which is devoted to the consecration of the elements. In this respect it agrees with the primitive liturgies, many of which have been preserved to our times; and because of this agreement, as well as of its scriptural import, it has, with the exception of one phrase, been adopted by the Episcopal Church in the United States of America.\*

---

\* In the first Liturgy of Edward the Sixth, and in the Scottish, the words, as already noticed, are, "Hear us, O most merciful Father, we beseech thee; and with thy Word and Holy Spirit, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son." The Invocation, as used in the American church, is as follows: "And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy Word and Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood." The oblation, that is, the offering or presenting of the bread and wine on the Lord's Table, is the same in all the three Offices.

I have already suggested that the eucharistic forms adopted by the Scottish Episcopalians have received the approbation of many learned divines in England. Though Bishop Horsley's opinion has been so frequently quoted that it is familiar to every one, I cannot deny myself the satisfaction of repeating it in your hearing. "I think the Scotch Office more conformable to the primitive models, and in my private judgment more edifying, than that which we now use; insomuch that were I at liberty to follow my private judgment, I would myself use the Scottish Office in preference. The alterations which were made in the Communion-Office, as it stood in the first book of Edward the Sixth, to humour the Calvinists, were in my opinion much for the worse: nevertheless, I think our present Office is very good; our form of consecration of the elements is sufficient; I mean that the elements *are consecrated* by it, and made the body and blood of Christ, in the sense in which our Lord himself said the bread and wine were his body and blood."

Sensible of the apparent defect in the present English Office, the pious Bishop Wilson, whose praise is in every church, in his "Short Introduction to the Lord's Supper," directed his readers, immediately after the prayer of consecration, to "*say secretly*, Send down thy Spirit and blessing upon this means of grace and salvation, which thou thyself, O Jesus, hast ordained. Most merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, look graciously upon the gifts now lying before thee, and *send down thy Holy Spirit* on this sacrifice, that he may make

this bread and wine the body and blood of thy Christ, that all who partake of them may be confirmed in godliness, may receive remission of their sins, and obtain everlasting life.”

Archdeacon Daubeny admitted that the Episcopal Church of Scotland, “by forming her Communion Service upon the model of that first set forth for the use of the Church of England, keeps closer to the original pattern of the primitive church than the Church of England herself now does.”—Bishop Fleetwood, in his “Reasonable Communicant,” observes, that “the church of Christ did heretofore pray that the Holy Spirit of God, coming down on the creatures of bread and wine, might make them the body and blood of Christ.”

In reference to the same subject, Dr Waterland remarks, that “in the liturgy of 1549 (the first of Edward) there was a solemn address to God for his propitious favour (a very ancient, eminent, and solemn part of the Communion Service), in these words:—‘We, thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension.’ Why this part, he adds, was struck out in the review I know not, unless it was owing to some scruple (which however was needless) about making the memorial before God, which at that time might appear to give some umbrage to the popish sacrifice, among such as knew not how to distinguish. However that were, we have still the

sum and substance of the primitive memorial remaining in our present Office ; not all in one place, but interspersed here and there in the exhortations and prayers.”

One of the latest historians of the English church, the present Bishop of Man, when adverting to the alterations introduced into the Communion-Office of the second Liturgy of Edward, remarks, “ It is difficult to understand why the invocation of the second and third Persons in the Trinity was left out: it has been wisely restored in the American Prayer-Book.”\* Approving the prayer that God by his Word and Holy Spirit would bless the bread and wine, this learned writer thereby acknowledges, and so far regrets, the want in the Anglican Office, where there is no longer any such petition.

In the face of the high authorities which have now been quoted, it must appear to every candid reasoner extremely absurd to charge the Scottish Communion with a popish tendency. It is obvious that the imputation of such error might, with a greater show of reason, be turned the other way. An able author of the seventeenth century observes, that the mere “ recital of the words of institution, *take, eat, this is my body*, passeth in the common vogue for a consecration. Were I *Romishly* inclined, I should rather impute unto them the power of *transubstantiation* ; for that a bare narrative can be qualified to conse-

---

\* A Sketch of the History of the Church of England to the Revolution 1688. By Thomas Vowler Short, B.D., Student of Christ Church, &c., 1832 ; vol. ii. p. 313.

crate, is certainly new divinity, unknown to scripture and to antiquity interpreting it. Therefore I must adhere in judgment to those learned men who derive consecration from the word of God and prayer, the very way by which our Saviour himself sanctified those elements in his first institution, *calling upon God for his blessing*, and *giving thanks*. Though the primitive fathers, in the act of consecration, did usually join the *narrative* of Christ's institution with the words of *blessing* and *thanksgiving*, thereby, as it were, showing their commission, yet were they far from imagining that the elements were sanctified any other way than by prayer. The Papists make the words of institution the great operators in the conversion ;" that is, of the elements into the real body of our Lord, in the process of transubstantiation.\*

Let it not be imagined that any insinuation is here conveyed against the doctrine of the Anglican Communion Service. Far be it from us to imitate, in this respect, a species of injustice which we regret in others, who, neglecting the general and avowed object of a sacred ritual, endeavour to support, on

---

\* Alliance of Divine Offices. By Hamon L'Estrange, Esq. Pp. 205, 206. Edition 1690. The defect to which this author alludes appears more distinctly in the rubric inserted in the Communion-Office itself. "If the consecrated bread or wine be all spent before all have communicated, the priest is to consecrate more, according to the form before prescribed, beginning at '*Our Saviour Christ, in the same night,*'" &c. This direction limits the consecration of the elements to the simple words of institution, without any prayer whatever.

insulated expressions, a conclusion utterly inconsistent with its general tenor. We acknowledge that the elements "are consecrated" by the use of the English Office, and therefore we consider it sufficient for accomplishing the holy purpose to which we apply it. Still, we ought to have a tender feeling towards those who do not see it in the same light, and, above all, to refrain from accusing them of unprotestant inclinations. Nor should we allow ourselves to forget that, in the hands of an ingenious adversary, a popular argument might be wielded, with great effect, towards establishing the unfair conclusion, that the English form, in the act of consecration, approaches more nearly to the Romish than any other used at the present day in Western Europe.

Most of us agree in the opinion so well expressed by Bishop Horsley, that the holy sacrament is regularly administered by the common Office, though the doctrine of the church is not distinctly brought out. By the ignorant and the dishonest the Scottish is said to approach nearer than the other to the Canon of the mass. Never was there a greater mistake; for while a Roman Catholic might receive the sacrament according to the English form, he could not possibly receive it according to the Scottish. In this last the prayer of Invocation is held indispensable—a prayer which an intelligent member of the Church of Rome could not tolerate, because it would imply that the bread and wine, after being transubstantiated—made the very body

and blood of our Lord—required to be blessed and sanctified!

The unwise and weak attacks recently made on our Communion Service have, as might be expected, produced a partial reaction in its favour, not unattended with some inconvenience. Many who were contented with the English form are no longer so; they perceive a defect to which they had not formerly adverted; they find that writers of great name in the United Church have bewailed the imperfect expression of the Consecration prayer; and they desire that the bread and wine should be blessed by supplicating the descent of the Holy Spirit, and not merely by repeating a text from Scripture.

The Scottish Office was gradually falling into disuse; and the practice of our people was becoming uniform in all parts of the country—a matter of no small consequence to our repose—when the assault made upon their belief, through virulent strictures on their sacramental form, induced many of them to have recourse to the examination of first principles, as these are involved in the history of the Liturgy at large. This feeling I find stronger among English persons, both lay and clerical, than among the indigenious Episcopalians; creating in some instances a considerable embarrassment to the directors of our ecclesiastical affairs.

Uniformity is on many accounts of the greatest value to us, and more especially as it would establish an entire agreement between the Anglican church and ourselves. For this reason alone, as the inter-



course between the two divisions of the kingdom is becoming every day more rapid and extensive, I should be inclined, were it necessary, to make a considerable sacrifice. Like every one who has diligently, and with a competent degree of knowledge and candour, compared the two Forms, I prefer the Scottish (which, in point of fact, is only a slight modification of the older English), because it enunciates more distinctly the real doctrine of the church, and is, at the same time, more in harmony with primitive usage. Still, holding with the great divines I have named, that the sacrament of the body and blood is rightly and duly administered to every devout communicant according to either ritual, I do not condemn myself or others for having relinquished the more ancient Office, and joined the majority of my clerical brethren in the use of that which received the sanction of those able prelates who directed the counsels of Queen Elizabeth. We may perhaps be accused of sacrificing to expediency not only catholic truth but the most venerable practice. I hope we are not chargeable with so great an offence; and in order to preclude the approach of hasty judgment or angry expostulation, allow me to recommend forbearance towards one another, as well as a careful study of the ancient liturgies, which will diffuse both light and kindness over our minds.

In early times, when the church of Christ was more truly one body than she has ever been since, a variety was allowed in the forms used for admi-

nistering the holy sacraments. Before the Reformation, too, a similar freedom was enjoyed in England, which, though it may have occasioned some inconvenience, was never imagined to infringe upon the entireness and sanctity of the faith. A similar feeling of confidence and generosity animated the heads of the ecclesiastical estate in England, a few years ago, when they consented to bring into full communion with their Establishment the kindred churches in Scotland and in the United States of America. The Archbishop of Canterbury and his brethren were not ignorant of the few variations in our respective Communion-Services; but being satisfied that there is no discrepancy in doctrine, they induced the legislature to confer upon the bill presented by the Primate in the House of Lords the full force of law, and thereby remove some unseemly anomalies in our professional intercourse.—(Note V., end.)

We ought ever to bear in mind that the catholic church of Christ is neither Rome nor a conventicle; and that schism is not only a great sin, but a proof of selfishness, pride, and vain-glory. "Separation," writes a modern bishop, "appears to be allowable only when a church is deserted because it holds doctrines which may endanger our salvation;" and on this ground he blames the English non-conformists in other times, many of whom could urge no good reason for their undutiful conduct. "They inflicted a wound upon our church," says he, "which time has not been able to cure, and created such a

spirit of division among us, that schism is now hardly deemed a sin.”\*

My brethren, let us not be apprehensive as to the ultimate welfare of our own portion of the Universal church. Her foundations are upon the holy hills, where the rising waters of strife and error will not reach her, nor cause any serious loss. The Episcopal Communion in Scotland encountered in former times much opposition in high places, originating in her adherence to certain political principles, which, whether right or wrong, she believed to be sacred. Her motives, now better appreciated, have not failed to do her honour. The stedfastness which induced the more prominent of her members to sacrifice all temporal advantages, rather than withdraw their allegiance where they thought it due, has in no instance been called to remembrance without respect; and it will enable her, through God’s blessing, to overcome the effects of any excitement which may have arisen from local or personal feelings.

The cause of order, in church and state, has ever had a strong hold on the minds of intelligent men living under a constitutional government; and without a very urgent reason, they will not long give their countenance to a needless separation—a great and groundless evil. But whatever may betide, let us at all times act under the impression that charity and quietness will accomplish much more than argument, however ingeniously or learnedly conducted.

---

\* Bishop Short’s Sketch, vol. ii. p. 283. First edition.

In looking back to the days which are past, we cannot but perceive that much has been lost, through want of consideration for the frailties of others ; and also that many good men have been gained to the interests of truth by being allowed time for reflection, and receiving the treatment due to friends, not to enemies. On no account let us quarrel about the sacred institutions of our holy faith. An old writer calls the Lord's Supper "the most blessed sacrament of Unity." Alas! it is not so with us, who have been compelled to view it through the cloud of contention and personal resentment. We are too apt to forget the saying of an ancient father, who endeavoured to cool the ardour of his contemporaries by whispering in their ears, "those mysteries which we cannot unfold, let us adore and then shut." The several branches of the catholic church ought to resemble those of the golden candlestick in the temple at Jerusalem, which, resting on one stem, diffused light, and the same light too, throughout the holy place. At all events, let us pray for peace ; and if those for whom we ask it be not worthy, our prayer will return into our own bosoms, loaded with a heavenly blessing which passeth all understanding.

## NOTES.

---

### NOTE I.

THE slight verbal alterations to which allusion is made in the text, are now, I believe, entirely discontinued; but as they have been recently urged in an English periodical as a proof that the Scottish Episcopalians do not honestly adhere to the ritual they profess to have adopted, I shall mention all the deviations that I have ever happened to witness during forty years.

- Our Father *which* art, altered to Our Father *who* art.  
Give *peace* in our time. „ Give *peace* and *truth*, &c.  
Who hast safely brought us to „ Who hast safely brought us  
the *beginning* of this day. *to this day*.  
Bishops and *curates*. „ Bishops and *pastors*.  
Defend us from all perils and „ Of the *ensuing* night.  
dangers of *this* night.  
Show thy pity on all prisoners „ Prisoners, *exiles*, and captives.  
and captives.  
Evils that we most *righteously* „ Most *justly* have deserved.  
have deserved.  
Unto whom all hearts *be* open. „ All hearts *are* open.

These are all the alterations or deviations I was accustomed to hear in church. Once, in Aberdeenshire, instead of the Ten Commandments, I heard a clergyman read the *summary* of them, as given by our Saviour in the Gospels; and once in Perthshire I witnessed a Confirmation, where the form in the first book of Edward VI. was prefixed to that inserted in the present edition of the Common Prayer. The Bishop said, “I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and lay my hand upon thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. Defend, O Lord, this thy servant with thy heavenly grace,” &c., as in the modern office.

## NOTE II.

Forms of Absolution were common in all the reformed churches in the time of Cranmer, and are to be found in their several Confessions and Rituals. In Knox's Liturgy, formerly used in Scotland, there are two. In the case of a penitent the minister was instructed to say: "If thou unfeignedly repent thy former iniquity, and believe on the Lord Jesus, then I, in his name, pronounce and affirm that thy sins are forgiven, not only in earth but also in heaven, according to the promises annexed with the preaching of his word, and to the power put in the ministry of his church."

When an excommunicated person was restored to christian fellowship, the following was used: "In the name and authoritie of Jesus Christ, I, the minister of his blessed Evangel, with consent of the whole ministrie and church, absolve thee, N, from the sentence of excommunication, from the sinne by thee committed, and from all censures laid against thee for the same before, according to thy repentance: And I pronounce thy sinne to be loosed in heaven, and thee to be received again to the societie of Jesus Christ, to his body the church, to the participation of his sacraments, and, finally, to the fruition of all his benefites; in the name of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Spirit. So be it."

## NOTE III.

There is a small difference between the Communion-Office now in use, and the one prepared for the Scottish church in the time of Charles the First. In the latter, the Invocation stands in the Consecration-prayer immediately *before* the words of institution, whereas in the former, as well as in all the ancient liturgies, it succeeds those words, and thereby makes the oblation to consist of the elements considered as simple bread and wine.

## NOTE IV.

An undue stress seems to be laid upon the different forms of expression used for denoting the effect of consecration on the elements, "that they may be"—"that they may be to us"—or "that they may become"—"the body and blood of thy dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ." The phrases appear to me to be equal in value, theologically and grammatically. When placed on the Lord's Table, the bread and wine are not "consecrated elements," or what the church

on the authority of Scripture calls the body and blood of our Lord ; but, after the prayer of consecration, they *are* his body and blood in the sense which he himself assigned to those mysterious words. A change has taken place, but it is one merely of *relation* and *efficacy*. Analogous changes are common in civil life. A piece of paper, not worth a halfpenny, is by a certain authoritative act made equal in value to many thousand pounds. In like manner, a bill on the table of either house of parliament is a mere tissue of printed pages without any effect whatever ; but when it receives the royal assent, which may be given either directly or by commission, it becomes a law of the land. Were the queen on any occasion solicited to give her assent to a bill which had passed both houses, would it make any difference whether the petitioners said, May it please your majesty to accord your royal assent, that the bill *may be*, or *may be to us*, or *may become*, a public statute or law of the realm ?—In all the cases now supposed, the validity of the official act depends on the authority with which it is exercised ; and the change accomplished is only a *relative* one.

## NOTE V.

The reference in the text is to an Act passed in the fourth year of Queen Victoria, entitled “An Act to make certain Provisions and Regulations in respect to the Exercise, within England and Ireland, of their Office by the Bishops and Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland.” Referring to an Act in the thirty-second year of George the Third, “*for granting Relief to Persons of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland,*” it proceeds to state, that “it is expedient to alter and amend the said Act, and to enable the Bishops of the said Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland, and the Priests of such church canonically ordained, under certain limitations and restrictions, to perform Divine Service, to preach, and to administer the Sacraments, according to the rites and ceremonies of the United Church of England and Ireland, in churches or chapels within England or Ireland, where the Liturgy of said United Church is used.”—The main “restriction” alluded to, is the necessity of procuring permission from the Ordinary of the diocese where the Bishop or Priest wishes to officiate : and if either remain more than two Sundays, the permission must be renewed.

As it fell to my lot on that occasion to be deputed by my brethren

of the Episcopal order here, to answer in London such questions as might be put to me relative to the objects of the proposed bill, I had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the reasons which dictated the restriction now mentioned. "When legislating," said one of their Lordships of the English Bench, "we cannot place you on a better footing than our own clergy: for the law of our church is, that the clergy of one diocese shall not officiate in any other diocese without permission from the Bishop of that other."—"This law," he added, "has long been a dead letter amongst us, for the clergy go from one diocese to another without asking any body's leave; and such will soon be the law which we are making for you." As the bill comprehended also the Episcopal Church in the United States, the clergy of which cannot be so familiarly known as we are to their English brethren of any order, the rule became necessarily a little more stringent than it would otherwise have been. One of our clergymen, however, has since the passing of the Act officiated three months at one time in an English diocese; obtaining, of course, from the Bishop the renewed permission.

This Act has materially improved our status, inasmuch as it affords a parliamentary recognition to our title as "The Bishops and Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland." The bill of Anno 32 Geo. III. described only two orders—those, namely, of pastors and ministers: that of Victoria not only restores the proper designation, but recognises in reference to the Bishops "the exercise of Episcopal functions" within their proper districts.

After the lapse of six years, I cannot write without a feeling of the deepest gratitude towards those exalted persons, the heads of the government and of the church, who united their influence in promoting the object to which this note alludes. Not only the Prelates, who wished to bring us nearer to themselves, as members of the same spiritual communion, but also the Prime Minister and his colleagues in office, manifested the greatest interest in our cause, and expressed a cordial satisfaction when their endeavours for our welfare were crowned with success.









